UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/478,309 | 01/06/2000 | SHARON M. GORDON | AUS990809US1 | 1520 |

35525 7590 04/08/2004

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| KLIMACH, PAULA W | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2135 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/478,309 | GORDON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Paula W Klimach | 2135 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 1/26/04 (Paper No. 6). Original application contained Claims 1-38. Applicant amended Claim 1. The amendment filed on 1/26/04 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are 1-38.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 1/26/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the new grounds of rejection given below.

The examiner asserts that the prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent Claims 1, 10, 17, 21, 30, 37, and 38. Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-20, 22-, 29, and 31-36 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action (Paper No. 6). Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-38 are respectfully maintained.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sampson (6,339,423) in view of (6,029,141).

*In reference to claims 1, 21, and 37,* Sampson discloses a system for processing data for providing access to resources within the data processing system, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of:

Receiving a request from a requestor to access a resource in the data processing system (column 5 lines 31-35).

Sending a first cookie to the requestor in response to the request, wherein the cookie is used to access the resource (column 8 lines 45-51 in combination with column 5 lines 35-60). After the authentication of the browser, it is sent a cookie which it then uses to access resources on server within the same domain.

Storing an identification of the requestor and the first cookie to form a stored identification and a stored cookie (column 2 lines 27-40). The client machine 110 inherently has identification information stored in the machine to identify itself to network. The browser receives the cookie and stores it.

The system is responsive to receiving a second cookie from a source, comparing an identification of the source and the second cookie with the stored identification and the stored cookie (column 5 lines 10-14 in combination with column 7 lines 57-59). The browser is authenticated and authentication information inherently contains identification information in order to complete the authentication, thus the process of authentication includes the step of identification and therefore would require identification information.

The system is further responsive to a verification of the cookie information and then allowing access to the resource (column 7 lines 13-15). Verification requires that the information in the cookie must match the expected information.

Sampson does not expressly disclose the second cookie being matched with a stored cookie.

However, Bezos discloses a verification process used to match the cookie with the information stored in the server.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to compare the cookie to information stored in the server in order to verify the user as in the method of Bezos in the system of Sampson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the information in the cookie is information compiled and used by the server therefore the cookie is a method for identifying the customer.

*In reference to claim 10, 30, and 38,* Sampson discloses a method in a data processing system for processing a cookie, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of:

Receiving a request form a source to access a resource in the data processing system (column 8 line 24). The Primary Domain Agent requests the resource stored on itself from the Multi-Domain Token Server on behalf of the browser. Sending a cookie to the source to form a sent cookie, wherein the sent cookie is used to access the resource (column 8 lines 12-14). The protected server is then responsive to receiving a subsequent cookie, authenticating the subsequent user (column 4 lines 57-60). The protected server is then responsive to authenticating the subsequent cookie, allowing access to the resource (column 4 line 60 to column 5 line 2).

Sampson does not expressly disclose the second cookie being authenticated with the cookie.

However, Bezos discloses a verification process used to match the cookie with the information stored in the server.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to compare the cookie to information stored in the server in order to verify the user as in the method of Bezos in the system of Sampson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the information in the cookie is information compiled and used by the server therefore the cookie is a method for identifying the customer.

*In reference to claim 17*, the claim is rejected as in the rejection for claim 1, in addition the system disclosed by Sampson comprising a cache (column 8 lines 15-17), and a cookie management process as rejected by the rejection for claim 1.

*In reference to claims 2 and 22* wherein access to the resource is allowed by accepting the second cookie (Sampson column 5 lines 14-16).

*In reference to claims 3 and 23*, wherein the system comprises: rejecting means, responsive to an absence of a match between the identification of the source and the second cookie and the stored identification and the stored cookie, for rejecting the second cookie (part 222 of Fig 8).

*In reference to claims 4, 9, 15, 16, 19, 24, 29, 35, and 36* wherein the resource is a file and the first cookie identifies disk location of the file. Sampson discloses the resource being a static file (column 31-52). The information about the file encompasses file location.

*In reference to claims 5, 14, 25, and 34*, wherein the source is a web server (Bezos et al Fig. 1). The device in Bezos that carries out the verification of the cookie is a web server.

*In reference to claims 6 and 26*, wherein the storing means for storing an identification of the source and the first cookie to form a stored identification and a stored cookie comprises: storing means for storing the identification of the source and the first cookie in a cache(column 8 lines 15-17).

*In reference to claim 20*, wherein the identification of the requestor and the identification of the source are Internet protocol addresses. Sampson discloses a system wherein the identification of the source is an Internet protocol address.

However Sampson does not expressly disclose the identification of the requestor being an internet protocol address.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the internet protocol address for the identification of the requestor in the system by Sampson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the internet protocol address is a common method of identifying a system on the network.

*In reference to claims 7 and 27*, Sampson discloses a system wherein the identification of the source is Internet protocol addresses (column 7 lines 45-50).

*In reference to claims 8 and 28*, wherein the receiving means, sending means, storing means, comparing means, and allowing means are performed in a browser. According to the teachings of Sampson, the distributed system may vary (column 6 lines 7-36). Therefore the server and client could all run on the same system and as a result all the functions as disclosed in claim 1 would be performed in the browser.

*In reference to claim 18*, wherein the requestor is a server.

*In reference to claims 11 and 31*, further comprising: storing means for storing the sent cookie and an identification of the source (column 7 lines 45-50).

*In reference to claims 12 and 32*, wherein the sent cookie and the identification of the source are stored in a cache (column 8 lines 15-17).

*In reference to claim 13 and 33*, wherein the identification is a stored identification and wherein the authenticating step comprises:

Comparing the stored identification with an identification of a source for the subsequent cookie; and comparing the sent cookie with the subsequent cookie.

Sampson does not expressly disclose the second cookie being authenticated with the cookie.

However, Bezos discloses a verification process used to match the cookie with the information stored in the server. The definition of a cookie is information that is stored on a browser for the use of the server. The information is received from the server as a result the server can use the information in the server for the authentication this is the equivalent of reconstructing the cookie and then using it to authenticate the first cookie, since the information used is the same.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to compare the cookie to information stored in the server in order to verify the user as in the method of Bezos in the system of Sampson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the information in the cookie is information compiled and used by the server therefore the cookie is a method for identifying the customer.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paula W Klimach whose telephone number is (703) 305-8421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PWK
Monday, April 05, 2004

GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100